

AN ALGEBRAIC FOUNDATION OF AMENDED DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS

DAN JONSSON

ABSTRACT. We present an innovative approach to dimensional analysis, based on a general representation theorem for complete quantity functions admitting a covariant scalar representation; this theorem is in turn grounded in a purely algebraic theory of quantity spaces. Examples of dimensional analysis based on this approach are given, showing that it allows results obtained by traditional dimensional analysis to be strengthened. For example, the orbital period of a two-body system can be derived without use of equations of motion.

1. INTRODUCTION

The central theorem in dimensional analysis is the so-called π theorem, with a long history featuring contributions by Fourier [9], Vaschy [21], Federman [8], Buckingham [5] and others. The π theorem shows how to transform a "physically meaningful" equation

$$(1) \quad t = \phi(t_1, \dots, t_n),$$

describing a relationship among quantities, into a more informative equation. This is done by representing ϕ as a product of the form $\prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_j} \psi$ so that, specifically,

$$(2) \quad t = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_j} \psi(y_1^*, \dots, y_{n-r}^*),$$

where $y_k^* = y_k \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{-W_{kj}}$ is a "dimensionless product" usually denoted Π_k or π_k , and $\{(x_1, \dots, x_r), (y_1, \dots, y_{n-r})\}$ is a particular partition of (t_1, \dots, t_n) .

In traditional dimensional analysis, ϕ is a real function, and t, t_1, \dots, t_n are measures of physical quantities. Various assumptions pertaining to ϕ, ψ, t, t_i, W_j , and W_{kj} have been made in connection with the development of the theory of dimensional analysis:

- Early proofs of the π theorem relied on assumptions that ϕ is well-behaved in terms of continuity or smoothness [10, pp. 67–71]. Langhaar [15] and Brand [3] later showed that a generalised homogeneity assumption suffices.
- It is usually assumed that $t, t_i > 0$. This assumption is necessary in some proofs of the π theorem, and avoids the anomaly that terms such as $(-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are not real numbers, but it restricts the scope of dimensional analysis.
- The exponents W_j and W_{kj} are usually assumed to be rational or real numbers [6, p. 293], but Quade [16] and more recently Raposo [18] use integer exponents (see also [1]).
- It is usually implicitly assumed that for any ϕ there is just one ψ such that (2) holds, or at least that it suffices to consider one ψ or, at the very least, deal with one ψ at a time. This way of thinking is challenged in [11] (see also [1, 12, 22]).

Following the development of quantity calculus [2], some versions of the π theorem where t, t_1, \dots, t_n are the quantities measured rather than the numerical measures obtained have also been proposed [7, 16, 23, 20, 18]. In that context, too, assumptions of the type highlighted above need to be addressed.

This article connects to and synthesises some recent developments in the theory of dimensional analysis [1, 11, 13, 17, 14]. To summarise, the new approach to dimensional analysis presented here is characterised by the following features:

- Rather than a real function ϕ we use a quantity function Φ on a quantity space Q , as defined in Section 2, so that t, t_1, \dots, t_n are seen as quantities. The only assumption needed about Φ is that it is a quantity function admitting a covariant scalar representation, as described below.
- Q can be a quantity space over any field, not only \mathbb{R} , so the (generalised) measures of the quantities t, t_1, \dots, t_n need not be real numbers. The quantities x_1, \dots, x_r are assumed to be non-zero, but there are no further constraints on t, t_1, \dots, t_n (or their measures).
- In equations (1) and (2), t is replaced by t^W , where W is a positive integer. In equation (2), W_j are integers and we have $y_k^* = y_k^{W_k} \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{-W_{kj}}$, where W_k are positive integers and W_{kj} integers.
- There may be more than one partition $\{(x_1, \dots, x_r), (y_1, \dots, y_{n-r})\}$ of (t_1, \dots, t_n) such that $t^W = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_j} \Psi(y_1^*, \dots, y_{n-r}^*)$ holds for particular W, W_j, W_k, W_{kj} and Ψ , so we actually have a non-empty set of equations

$$t^{W(\ell)} = \prod_{j=1}^r x_{(\ell)j}^{W_{(\ell)j}} \Psi_{\ell}(y_{(\ell)1}^*, \dots, y_{(\ell)n-r}^*) \quad (\ell = 1, \dots, S).$$

After some preliminaries in Section 2, the main representation theorem is stated and proved in Section 3 and applied to problems of dimensional analysis in Sections 4 and 5. Examples of dimensional analysis are found in Section 6, and physical assumptions underlying dimensional analysis are touched on in Section 7.

2. PRELIMINARIES

For the sake of completeness, let us first briefly review some elements of the theory of quantity spaces [11, 13]. A *scalable monoid* over a ring R is a monoid Q equipped with an R -action \cdot on Q ,

$$R \times Q \rightarrow Q, \quad (\alpha, x) \mapsto \alpha \cdot x,$$

such that for any $\alpha, \beta \in R$ and $x, y \in Q$ we have $1 \cdot x = x$, $\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x) = \alpha\beta \cdot x$, and $\alpha \cdot xy = (\alpha \cdot x)y = x(\alpha \cdot y)$; as a consequence, $(\alpha \cdot x)(\beta \cdot y) = \alpha\beta \cdot xy$. We denote the identity element of Q by 1_Q , and set $x^0 = 1_Q$ for any $x \in Q$. An element $x \in Q$ may have an inverse $x^{-1} \in Q$ such that $xx^{-1} = x^{-1}x = 1_Q$.

A (strong) finite *basis* for a scalable monoid Q is a set $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ of invertible elements of Q such that every $x \in Q$ has a unique expansion

$$x = \mu_{\mathcal{E}}(x) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^m e_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{(x)j}},$$

where $\mu_{\mathcal{E}}(x) \in R$ and $\mathfrak{W}_{(x)j}$ are integers. A (finitely generated) *quantity space* is a commutative scalable monoid Q over a field K , such that there exists a finite basis for Q . The elements of a quantity space are called *quantities*. We may think of $\mu_{\mathcal{E}}(x)$ as the measure of x relative to the derived unit $\prod_{j=1}^m e_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{(x)j}}$ in a coherent system of units, and indirectly relative to the base units in \mathcal{E} .

The relation \sim on Q defined by $x \sim y$ if and only if $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in K$ is a congruence on Q . The corresponding equivalence classes are called *dimensions*; $[x]$ is the dimension that contains x . We have $[\lambda \cdot x] = [x]$ for any $\lambda \in K, x \in Q$. The set of all dimensions in Q , denoted Q/\sim , is a finitely generated free abelian group with multiplication defined by $[x][y] = [xy]$ and identity element $[1_Q]$.

The quantities in a dimension $C \in Q/\sim$ form a one-dimensional vector space over K with addition inherited from K and a unique zero vector or *zero quantity* $0_C \neq 1_Q$. While $0_C x = 0_{C[x]}$ for every $x \in Q$, the product of non-zero quantities is a non-zero quantity. A quantity is invertible if and only if it is non-zero, and any $u \in C$ such that $u \neq 0_C$ is a *unit quantity* for C , meaning that for every $x \in C$ there is a unique $\mu \in K$ for u such that $x = \mu \cdot u$, where $\mu = 0$ if and only if $x = 0_C$.

We can now state some important definitions relating to dimensional analysis. A (dimensional) *quantity function* on a quantity space Q over K is a function

$$(3) \quad \Phi : C_1 \times \cdots \times C_n \rightarrow C_0,$$

where $C_i \in Q/\sim$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$. Equation (1) now takes the form

$$(4) \quad q = \Phi(q_1, \dots, q_n).$$

A *dimensionally complete* quantity function is a quantity function of the form (3) such that there is a subtuple (E_1, \dots, E_r) of (C_1, \dots, C_n) , a *local dimensional basis*, such that $r \geq 0$ and every C_i has a unique expansion, with \mathfrak{W}_{ij} integers,

$$C_i = \prod_{j=1}^r E_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} \quad (r \geq 1), \quad C_i = \prod_{j=1}^0 E_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} = [1_Q].$$

A *complete* quantity function is a dimensionally complete quantity function with a local dimensional basis (E_1, \dots, E_r) and a corresponding *local basis*, a tuple of non-zero quantities $E = (e_1, \dots, e_r) \in \times_{j=1}^r E_j$, where $E = (1_Q)$ for $r = 0$, such that every $q_i \in C_i$ has a unique expansion, with \mathcal{W}_{ij} integers and $\mu_E(q_i) \in K$,

$$q_i = \mu_E(q_i) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathcal{W}_{ij}} \quad (r \geq 1), \quad q_i = \mu_E(q_i) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^0 e_j^{\mathcal{W}_{ij}} = \mu_{(1_Q)}(q_i) \cdot 1_Q.$$

A *covariant scalar representation* of a complete quantity function Φ of the form (3) is a function $\phi : K^n \rightarrow K$ such that

$$(5) \quad \mu_E(q) = \phi(\mu_E(q_1), \dots, \mu_E(q_n))$$

for every local basis E associated with Φ and any q_1, \dots, q_n .

Alternatively, one could define a covariant scalar representation in terms of a (global) basis \mathcal{E} for Q rather than a local basis E (see [11]). The common idea is that Φ is not affected by a choice of (base) units, and for ϕ to similarly remain unchanged when units change the left-hand and right-hand sides of (5) and its $\mu_{\mathcal{E}}$ -analogue must change in tandem so that the two sides remain equal.

Note that a complete quantity function need not have a covariant scalar representation. For example, if $C \neq [1_Q]$ and $0_C \neq e \in C$ then any quantity function $\Phi : C \rightarrow [1_Q]$ is complete with local dimensional basis (C) and local basis (e) since $q_1 = \mu_{(e)}(q_1) \cdot e^1$ and $q = \mu_{(e)}(q) \cdot e^0$ are unique expansions (recall that $1_Q \neq 0_{[1_Q]}$), but if we set $\Phi_u(\lambda \cdot u) = \lambda \cdot 1_Q$ for some $0_C \neq u \in C$ then $\mu_{(u)}(u) = \mu_{(2 \cdot u)}(2 \cdot u) = 1$, whereas $\mu_{(u)}(\Phi_u(u)) = 1$ but $\mu_{(2 \cdot u)}(\Phi_u(2 \cdot u)) = 2$ since $u^0 = (2 \cdot u)^0 = 1_Q$. Hence, there is no function $\phi_u : K \rightarrow K$ such that $\mu_E(\Phi_u(q_1)) = \phi_u(\mu_E(q_1))$ for every E and $q_1 \in C$. In fact, if $C \neq [1_Q]$ and $\Phi : C \rightarrow [1_Q]$ admits a covariant scalar representation then Φ is a constant function; see Example 1 in Section 6.

3. MAIN THEOREM

In view of how these concepts were defined above, a complete quantity function is necessarily dimensionally complete, and a quantity function with a covariant scalar representation is necessarily complete. On the other hand, by Theorem 1, corresponding to the π theorem, every dimensionally complete quantity function is complete, and if it has a covariant scalar representation then it has a representation of the form shown in (2).

Let us first verify some basic facts needed in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 1. *Let Q be a quantity space over K and let $E = (e_1, \dots, e_r)$ be a local basis such that $x = \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}(x)j}$ and $y = \mu_E(y) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}(y)j}$ are the unique expansions of $x, y \in Q$ relative to E .*

Then (a) $\mu_E(xy) = \mu_E(x)\mu_E(y)$, (b) if x is invertible then $\mu_E(x^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\mu_E(x)}$, (c) if $x \in [1_Q]$ then $\mu_E(x)$ does not depend on E , and (d) if $[x] = [y]$ and y is invertible then $xy^{-1} \in [1_Q]$ and $\mu_E(xy^{-1}) = \frac{\mu_E(x)}{\mu_E(y)}$ does not depend on E .

Proof. We will be using the fact that expansions of the form $q = \mu_E(q) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}(q)j}$ are unique, given E . Recall that $(\mu \cdot u)(\mu' \cdot u') = \mu\mu' \cdot uu'$, so

$$xy = \mu_E(x)\mu_E(y) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{(\mathfrak{W}(x)j + \mathfrak{W}(y)j)},$$

proving (a). Clearly, $1_Q = 1 \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^0$ for any E , so

$$\mu_E(x)\mu_E(x^{-1}) = \mu_E(xx^{-1}) = \mu_E(1_Q) = 1,$$

proving (b). Also, $1_Q = \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^0$ is a unit quantity for $[1_Q]$, so if $x \in [1_Q]$ then $x = \mu \cdot 1_Q = \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^0$, and $\prod_{j=1}^r e_j^0$ does not depend on E , so $\mu_E(x)$ does not depend on E , verifying (c). Finally, (d) follows from the fact that $[xy^{-1}] = [x][y^{-1}] = [x][y]^{-1} = [1_Q]$ together with (a), (b), and (c). \square

Theorem 1. *Let Q be a quantity space over K , let Φ be a quantity function on Q ,*

$$(6) \quad \Phi : \mathbb{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_0 \quad (n \geq 0), \quad (x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_{n-r}) \mapsto y_0,$$

and let there be unique tuples of integers $(\mathfrak{W}_{i1}, \dots, \mathfrak{W}_{ir})$ such that

$$(7) \quad \mathbb{C}_i = \prod_{j=1}^r \mathbb{C}_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} \quad (i = 0, \dots, n).$$

Then Φ is complete, and if Φ has a covariant scalar representation then there exists a unique quantity function of $n - r$ arguments

$$\Psi : [1_Q] \times \dots \times [1_Q] \rightarrow [1_Q]$$

such that if $x_j \neq 0_{\mathbb{C}_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$ then

$$(8) \quad \pi_0 = \Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}),$$

or equivalently

$$(9) \quad y_0 = \Phi(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_{n-r}) = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{0j}} \Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}),$$

where $W_{0j} = \mathfrak{W}_{0j}$, $W_{kj} = \mathfrak{W}_{(k+r)j}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n - r$, and

$$\pi_k = y_k \left(\prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{kj}} \right)^{-1} \quad (k = 0, \dots, n - r).$$

Proof. Set $E = (e_1, \dots, e_r)$, where $0_{C_j} \neq e_j \in C_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$. Then

$$C_i = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} = \prod_{j=1}^r [e_j]^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} = \left[\prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} \right] \quad (i = 0, \dots, n),$$

so for every $q_i \in C_i$ there is a unique $\mu_E(q_i) \in K$ for $\prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}}$ such that

$$(10) \quad q_i = \mu_E(q_i) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} \quad (i = 0, \dots, n)$$

because $0_{C_i} \neq \prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}} \in C_i$ so that $\prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{ij}}$ is a unit quantity for C_i . Also, if q_i has another expansion in terms of the integers \mathfrak{W}'_{ij} then

$$C_i = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{\mathfrak{W}'_{ij}} = \left[\prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}'_{ij}} \right] = [q_i] = \left[\prod_{j=1}^r e_j^{\mathfrak{W}'_{ij}} \right] = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{\mathfrak{W}'_{ij}},$$

so the integers \mathfrak{W}_{ij} in (10) are unique by the uniqueness of the expansion of C_i .

Given \mathfrak{W}_{ij} (and thus W_{kj}) by (7) and $0_{C_j} \neq x_j \in C_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$, set

$$\Delta_k = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{kj}} \quad (k = 0, \dots, n-r).$$

Then Δ_k is non-zero and $[\Delta_k] = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{W_{kj}} = [y_k]$ since $[y_0] = C_0 = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{0j}} = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{W_{0j}}$ and $[y_k] = C_{k+r} = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{\mathfrak{W}_{(k+r)j}} = \prod_{j=1}^r C_j^{W_{kj}}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n-r$. Thus, Δ_k^{-1} exists, and denoting $\mu_E(y_k \Delta_k^{-1})$ by $\nu_E(y_k)$ we have, by Lemma 1(d),

$$\nu_E(y_k) = \mu_E(y_k \Delta_k^{-1}) = \frac{\mu_E(y_k)}{\mu_E(\Delta_k)} \quad (k = 0, \dots, n-r),$$

where $y_k \Delta_k^{-1} \in [1_Q]$ and $\nu_E(y_k)$ does not depend on E . Also, by Lemma 1(a),

$$\mu_E(\Delta_k) = \mu_E\left(\prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{kj}}\right) = \prod_{j=1}^r \mu_E(x_j)^{W_{kj}} \quad (k = 0, \dots, n-r).$$

Let \mathbf{q} denote the sequence of quantities $x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_{n-r}$, and let $\tau_E(\mathbf{q})$ be the sequence of scalars $\mu_E(x_1), \dots, \mu_E(x_r), \mu_E(y_1), \dots, \mu_E(y_{n-r})$. By assumption, there is a function $\phi : K^n \rightarrow K$ such that $\mu_E(\Phi(\mathbf{q})) = \phi(\tau_E(\mathbf{q}))$ for any \mathbf{q} and E , so as $x_j \neq 0_{C_j}, \mu_E(x_j) \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$ there is a function $\phi : K^n \rightarrow K$ such that for any \mathbf{q} and E we have

$$\nu_E(y_0) = \frac{\mu_E(\Phi(\mathbf{q}))}{\mu_E(\Delta_0)} = \frac{\phi(\tau_E(\mathbf{q}))}{\prod_{j=1}^r \mu_E(x_j)^{W_{0j}}} = \phi(\tau_E(\mathbf{q})).$$

Furthermore, there is, for given W_{kj} , a bijection between scalar sequences

$$\omega : \tau_E(\mathbf{q}) \longmapsto \mu_E(x_1), \dots, \mu_E(x_r), \frac{\mu_E(y_1)}{\prod_{j=1}^r \mu_E(x_j)^{W_{1j}}}, \dots, \frac{\mu_E(y_{n-r})}{\prod_{j=1}^r \mu_E(x_j)^{W_{(n-r)j}}},$$

so there is a function $\chi = \phi \circ \omega^{-1} : K^n \rightarrow K$ such that

$$(11) \quad \nu_E(y_0) = \phi(\tau_E(\mathbf{q})) = \chi(\mu_E(x_1), \dots, \mu_E(x_r), \nu_E(y_1), \dots, \nu_E(y_{n-r})).$$

Now set $X = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$. By assumption, $0_{C_j} \neq x_j \in C_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$, so any $q_i \in C_i$ has a unique expansion of the form (10) relative to both E and X , and $\nu_E(y_k) = \nu_X(y_k)$ for any E and $k = 0, \dots, n-r$. Equation (11) holds for $E = X$ as it holds for any E . There is thus a function $\psi : K^{n-r} \rightarrow K$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_E(y_0) &= \nu_X(y_0) = \chi(1, \dots, 1, \nu_X(y_1), \dots, \nu_X(y_{n-r})) \\ &= \psi(\nu_X(y_1), \dots, \nu_X(y_{n-r})) = \psi(\nu_E(y_1), \dots, \nu_E(y_{n-r})) \end{aligned}$$

for any E , since $x_j = 1 \cdot x_j$ so that $\mu_X(x_j) = 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$.

1_Q is a unit quantity for $[1_Q]$, and $\nu_E(y_k)$ does not depend on E , so we can define a quantity function of $n - r$ arguments

$$\Psi : [1_Q] \times \cdots \times [1_Q] \rightarrow [1_Q]$$

by setting

$$\Psi(\nu_E(y_1) \cdot 1_Q, \dots, \nu_E(y_{n-r}) \cdot 1_Q) = \Psi(\nu_E(y_1), \dots, \nu_E(y_{n-r})) \cdot 1_Q,$$

so that

$$(12) \quad \nu_E(y_0) \cdot 1_Q = \Psi(\nu_E(y_1) \cdot 1_Q, \dots, \nu_E(y_{n-r}) \cdot 1_Q).$$

Also, $q = \mu_X(q) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^0$ is the unique expansion of $q \in [1_Q]$ relative to X , so

$$\nu_E(y_k) \cdot 1_Q = \nu_X(y_k) \cdot 1_Q = \mu_X(y_k \Delta_k^{-1}) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^0 = y_k \Delta_k^{-1}$$

for any E and $k = 0, \dots, n - r$. Thus, (12) translates to

$$y_0 \Delta_0^{-1} = \Psi(y_1 \Delta_1^{-1}, \dots, y_{n-r} \Delta_{n-r}^{-1}) \quad \text{or} \quad \pi_0 = \Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r});$$

recall that $y_k \Delta_k^{-1} = y_k \left(\prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{kj}} \right)^{-1} = \pi_k$ for $k = 0, \dots, n - r$.

We have thus proved the existence of a function Ψ that represents Φ by equation (8) or (9). Finally, if $\Delta_0 \Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}) = y_0 = \Delta_0 \Psi'(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r})$ then $\Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}) = \Psi'(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r})$ since Δ_0 is invertible, so Ψ is unique. \square

In this proof, E is not assumed to be a basis for Q , but only a local basis. This would seem to facilitate the generalization of Theorem 1 to certain other commutative scalable monoids than finitely generated quantity spaces.

There is a result of the same kind as Theorem 1 for "physically meaningful" scalar functions. Specifically, if $\phi : K^n \rightarrow K$ is a covariant scalar representation of a complete quantity function Φ then there is a scalar function $\psi : K^{n-r} \rightarrow K$ such that

$$\phi(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = \prod_{j=1}^r \xi_j^{W_{0j}} \psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}),$$

where $\zeta_i = \mu_E(q_i)$, $\xi_j = \mu_E(x_j)$ and $\pi_k = \nu_E(y_k)$ for some local basis E .

The condition that x_1, \dots, x_r are non-zero quantities is natural and necessary; note that y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-r} are not restricted. The commonly made assumption that quantities are positive (or have positive measures) presupposes that K is an ordered field such as the real numbers, but the present representation theorem holds for any field, for example, the complex numbers. Only real numbers are used in the examples of dimensional analysis in Section 6, however.

By definition, y_k occurs only in π_k , so if the quantities y_1, \dots, y_{n-r} (but not necessarily their dimensions) are independent (as they should be) then π_1, \dots, π_{n-r} are independent, too.

Q has no zero divisors, so (9) implies that $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_{n-r}) = 0_{C_0}$ if and only if $\Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}) = 0_{[1_Q]}$, given that $x_j \neq 0_{C_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$. Thus, a solution set of n -tuples of quantities is reduced to an equivalent set of $n - r$ -tuples of quantities. This equivalence corresponds to the form of the π theorem given by Vaschy [21] and Buckingham [5], whereas Federman [8] proved an identity of the form (9). (Vaschy's and Buckingham's proofs were sketchy, and Federman's proof covered only a special case, but this was pioneering work.)

4. ANALYSIS OF DIMENSION TUPLES

Given a quantity space Q , consider a *dimension tuple* $\mathcal{D} = ([q_1], \dots, [q_n], [q_0])$, where $q_i \in Q$ and $n \geq 0$. An (internally) *independent* subtuple of \mathcal{D} is a subtuple (D_1, \dots, D_ρ) of \mathcal{D} such that if $\prod_{j=1}^\rho D_j^{\kappa_j} = 1_Q$ then $\kappa_j = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, \rho$. (Note that a subtuple preserves the sequential order of entries in the original tuple.) A *maximal independent* subtuple of \mathcal{D} is an independent subtuple of \mathcal{D} which is not a proper subtuple of an independent subtuple of \mathcal{D} . The empty subtuple \emptyset of a dimension tuple is vacuously independent. Thus, every \mathcal{D} has a maximal independent subtuple, possibly \mathcal{D} itself, since every non-repetitive chain of independent subtuples $\emptyset \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{D}_\rho$ is finite, ending no later than when $\mathcal{D}_\rho = \mathcal{D}$.

Recall that Q/\sim is a free abelian group and that by the Steinitz exchange lemma any two finite maximal independent subsets of a free abelian group have the same cardinality, the rank of the group. An independent subtuple of \mathcal{D} cannot have duplicated entries, so it can be regarded as a set in this context, and the exchange lemma can be used also to show that any two maximal independent subtuples of \mathcal{D} have the same cardinality r , the *rank of the dimension tuple* \mathcal{D} .

An *adequate* partition of \mathcal{D} is a partition of \mathcal{D} into three dimension tuples

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{A} = ([x_1], \dots, [x_r]), \quad \mathcal{B} = ([y_1], \dots, [y_{n-r}]), \quad \mathcal{C} = ([y_0])$$

such that \mathcal{A} is a maximal independent subtuple of \mathcal{D} and $n \geq r \geq 0$. (The idea is that \mathcal{A} is a local dimensional basis and y_0 a dependent variable.) A dimension tuple \mathcal{D} clearly admits an adequate partition unless the maximal independent subtuple of \mathcal{D} is \mathcal{D} itself. There may in fact be more than one adequate partition of \mathcal{D} , since there may be more than one maximal independent proper subtuple \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{D} , and for each \mathcal{A} the given \mathcal{D} may contain more than one entry not in \mathcal{A} . When $n > r$ so that \mathcal{B} is non-empty, we can either choose $[y_0]$ first and then choose \mathcal{A} as a maximal independent tuple of other dimensions in \mathcal{D} than $[y_0]$, or we can choose \mathcal{A} first and then choose $[y_0]$ among the remaining dimensions in \mathcal{D} .

If $([x_1], \dots, [x_r])$ is independent but $([y_k], [x_1], \dots, [x_r])$ is not independent then there is a tuple of integers $\mathbf{w}_k = (w_k, w_{k1}, \dots, w_{kr})$ such that $[y_k]^{-w_k} \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{w_{kj}} = 1_Q$ and $w_k \neq 0$. Hence, if $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}\}$ is an adequate partition of \mathcal{D} then

$$(14) \quad [y_k]^{w_k} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{w_{kj}},$$

for $k = 0, \dots, n - r$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $w_k > 0$.

Suppose that we also have

$$[y_k]^{w'_k} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{w'_{kj}}$$

for a tuple of integers $\mathbf{w}'_k = (w'_k, w'_{k1}, \dots, w'_{kr})$ where $w'_k > 0$. Furthermore, let $\mathbf{W}_k = (W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr})$ be the tuple obtained by dividing \mathbf{w}_k through by $\gcd \mathbf{w}_k$, and $\mathbf{W}'_k = (W'_k, W'_{k1}, \dots, W'_{kr})$ be the tuple obtained by dividing \mathbf{w}'_k through by $\gcd \mathbf{w}'_k$. Then, $W_k, W'_k > 0$ and $\gcd \mathbf{W}_k = \gcd \mathbf{W}'_k = 1$. If $W_k = W'_k$ then

$$[x_1]^{W_{k1} - W'_{k1}} \dots [x_r]^{W_{kr} - W'_{kr}} = [y_k]^{W_k - W'_k} = [1_Q],$$

so $\mathbf{W}_k = \mathbf{W}'_k$ since $([x_1], \dots, [x_r])$ is independent. In any case, (14) implies that $[y_k]^{W_k W'_k} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{W_{kj} W'_{kj}}$. Dividing $(W_k W'_k, W_{k1} W'_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr} W'_{kr})$ through by W_k gives \mathbf{W}'_k since $(W_k W'_k)/W_k = W'_k$, but as \mathbf{W}'_k is an integer tuple this implies

$$W_k \leq \gcd(W_k W'_k, W_{k1} W'_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr} W'_{kr}) = W'_k.$$

By symmetry $W'_k \leq W_k$, so $W_k = W'_k$, so again $\mathbf{W}_k = \mathbf{W}'_k$. There is thus, for every $k = 0, \dots, n - r$, a unique tuple of integers $(W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr})$ such that

$$(15) \quad [y_k]^{W_k} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{W_{kj}},$$

$W_k > 0$ and $\gcd(W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr}) = 1$.

It follows from this result that $(w_k, w_{k1}, \dots, w_{kr})$, with $w_k > 0$, satisfies (14) if and only if $(w_k, w_{k1}, \dots, w_{kr}) = (\kappa W_k, \kappa W_{k1}, \dots, \kappa W_{kr})$ for some positive integer κ .

Also, for $j = 1, \dots, r$, $[x_j]$ has the trivial expansion

$$(16) \quad [x_j] = [x_1]^0 \cdots [x_{j-1}]^0 [x_j]^1 [x_{j+1}]^0 \cdots [x_r]^0,$$

relative to $\mathcal{A} = ([x_1], \dots, [x_r])$, and this expansion is unique since \mathcal{A} is independent.

Thus, given an adequate partition (13) of $\mathcal{D} = ([q_1], \dots, [q_n], [q_0])$, any function

$$\Phi^* : [x_1] \times \cdots \times [x_r] \times [y_1^{W_1}] \times \cdots \times [y_{n-r}^{W_{n-r}}] \rightarrow [y_0^{W_0}]$$

is dimensionally complete in view of the unique expansions (15) and (16) and the fact that $[y_k^{W_k}] = [y_k]^{W_k}$. It thus follows from Theorem 1 that Φ^* is complete and that, assuming that Φ^* admits a covariant scalar representation Φ^* , there exists a unique quantity function of $n - r$ arguments

$$\Psi : [1_Q] \times \cdots \times [1_Q] \rightarrow [1_Q]$$

such that if $x_j \neq 0_{[x_j]}$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$ then

$$y_0^{W_0} = \Phi^*(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1^{W_1}, \dots, y_{n-r}^{W_{n-r}}) = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{0j}} \Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}),$$

where $\pi_k = y_k^{W_k} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{kj}} \right)^{-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n - r$. Given Φ^* , there is also a unique function

$$\Phi : [x_1] \times \cdots \times [x_r] \times [y_1] \times \cdots \times [y_{n-r}] \rightarrow [y_0^{W_0}]$$

such that

$$\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_{n-r}) = \Phi^*(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1^{W_1}, \dots, y_{n-r}^{W_{n-r}}).$$

Thus,

$$(17) \quad y_0^{W_0} = \Phi(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_{n-r}) = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{0j}} \Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}),$$

where π_k is defined as above; note that (17) generalises (9) in Theorem 1.

We have thus shown that a non-empty set of adequate partitions of \mathcal{D} such that $\mathcal{C} = ([y_0])$ for some fixed $[y_0] \in \mathcal{D}$ yields a set of $S \geq 1$ equations

$$(18) \quad \begin{cases} y_0^{W_{(1)0}} = \prod_{j=1}^r x_{(1)j}^{W_{(1)0j}} \Psi_1(\pi_{(1)1}, \dots, \pi_{(1)n-r}), \\ \dots \\ y_0^{W_{(S)0}} = \prod_{j=1}^r x_{(S)j}^{W_{(S)0j}} \Psi_S(\pi_{(S)1}, \dots, \pi_{(S)n-r}), \end{cases}$$

where r is the rank of \mathcal{D} . Each such equation corresponds to a maximal independent subtuple \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{D} that does not contain $[y_0]$.

If (18) is not already a system of simultaneous equations, it can be made into one by setting $\Lambda_{(\ell)} = \text{lcm}(W_{(1)0}, \dots, W_{(S)0})/W_{(\ell)0}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, S$ and replacing the ℓ th equation in (18) by

$$(19) \quad y_0^{W_0} = \prod_{j=1}^r x_{(\ell)j}^{\Lambda_{(\ell)} W_{(\ell)0j}} \Psi_{\ell}(\pi_{(\ell)1}, \dots, \pi_{(\ell)n-r})^{\Lambda_{(\ell)}},$$

where $W_0 = \text{lcm}(W_{(1)0}, \dots, W_{(S)0}) = \Lambda_{(\ell)} W_{(\ell)0}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, S$.

For convenience, we may use notation similar to that in Section 1, simplifying $y_0^{W_0}$ to y^W , $y_0^{W_{(\ell)0}}$ to $y^{W_{(\ell)}}$ and $W_{(\ell)0j}$ to $W_{(\ell)j}$.

Given Φ , Φ^* and ϕ^* , we define the covariant scalar representation of Φ to be the function $\phi : K^n \rightarrow K$ given by

$$\phi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{n-r}) = \Phi^*(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r, \eta_1^{W_1}, \dots, \eta_{n-r}^{W_{n-r}}).$$

As Φ need not be complete, although it is associated with a complete quantity function Φ^* , we have thus extended the notion of a covariant scalar representation. By this extended definition, Φ has a covariant scalar representation if and only if there is a corresponding complete quantity function Φ^* with a covariant scalar representation.

While the original definition of a covariant scalar representation was appropriate in the context of Theorem 1, the generalised definition makes it possible to restate the core conclusion from the argument presented in this section as an apparent generalisation of Theorem 1, derived, however, by an application of this theorem. Similar results, which may likewise be regarded as reformulations of Theorem 1, are found in [12, pp. 16–19] and [18, pp. 75–76].

Theorem 2. *Let Q be a quantity space over K , let Φ be a quantity function on Q ,*

$$\Phi : \mathbf{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathbf{C}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_0 \quad (n \geq 0), \quad (q_1, \dots, q_n) \mapsto q_0,$$

let $\mathcal{D} = ([q_1], \dots, [q_n], [y_0])$ be a dimension tuple such that there exists a minimal positive integer W such that $y_0^W = q_0$, and let

$$\mathcal{A} = ([x_1], \dots, [x_r]), \quad \mathcal{B} = ([y_1], \dots, [y_{n-r}]), \quad \mathcal{C} = ([y_0])$$

be an adequate partition of \mathcal{D} . Then there are unique tuples of integers

$$(W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr}) \quad (k = 0, \dots, n-r),$$

where $W_k > 0$ and $\text{gcd}(W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr}) = 1$, such that if Φ has a covariant scalar representation then there exists a unique quantity function of $n-r$ arguments

$$\Psi : [1_Q] \times \dots \times [1_Q] \rightarrow [1_Q]$$

such that if $x_j \neq 0_{\mathbf{C}_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$ then

$$y_0^{W_0} = \Phi(q_1, \dots, q_n) = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{0j}} \Psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}),$$

where $W_0 = W$ and

$$\pi_k = y_k^{W_k} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_{kj}} \right)^{-1} \quad (k = 1, \dots, n-r).$$

Note that if $[q_0] \neq [1_Q]$ and $y_0^w = q_0$ for some $w > 0$ then $W = w$ as w is unique, but if $[q_0] = [1_Q]$ and $y_0^w = q_0$ for some $w > 0$ then $W = 1$.

5. USE OF DIMENSIONAL MATRICES

We have shown that, given a dimension tuple $\mathcal{D} = ([q_1], \dots, [q_n], [y_0])$, the information needed to derive the equations in (18) is a list of all adequate partitions $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} = ([y_0])\}$ of \mathcal{D} and, for each $\mathcal{A} = ([x_1], \dots, [x_r])$ and each $[y_k]$ in \mathcal{D} but not in \mathcal{A} , a tuple of integers $(w_k, w_{k1}, \dots, w_{kr})$ such that $w_k \neq 0$ and $[y_k]^{w_k} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{w_{kj}}$; as $[y_k]^{-w_k} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{-w_{kj}}$ we may assume that $w_k > 0$.

In dimensional analysis, narrowly conceived, this information comes from a *dimensional matrix* showing how the dimensions in \mathcal{D} are expressed as products of dimensions of certain base units. Specifically, let $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{E}_1, \dots, \mathbf{E}_m\}$ be a basis for Q/\sim . Then any entry $[q_i] = \mathbf{D}_i$ in \mathcal{D} can be expressed uniquely as

$$(20) \quad \mathbf{D}_i = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{D_{i\ell}} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{D}_i = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{D_{\ell i}} \quad (i = 0, \dots, n).$$

There are corresponding dimensional matrices

$$[D_{i\ell}] = \begin{bmatrix} \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ D_{i1} & \cdots & D_{im} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \end{bmatrix}, \quad [D_{\ell i}] = \begin{bmatrix} \cdots & D_{1i} & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & D_{mi} & \cdots \end{bmatrix},$$

which collect the exponents that describe the expansions of $\mathbf{D}_0, \dots, \mathbf{D}_n$ relative to \mathcal{E} ; we will use $[D_{\ell i}]$ here. Corresponding to an adequate partition of \mathcal{D} into \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} , $[D_{\ell i}]$ can be partitioned into three matrices,

$$[A_{\ell i}], \quad [B_{\ell i}], \quad [C_{\ell i}],$$

constituting a *dimensional model* derived from $[D_{\ell i}]$.

Let \mathbf{u}_i denote the column vector $(D_{1i}, \dots, D_{mi})^\top$; in view of (20) there is a bijection $\mathbf{D}_i \mapsto \mathbf{u}_i$ between the dimensions in \mathcal{D} and the column vectors in $[D_{\ell i}]$. Also let $(\mathbf{D}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{D}_{i_\rho})$ be a subtuple of \mathcal{D} , corresponding to a tuple of column vectors $(\mathbf{u}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{i_\rho})$. To avoid notational clutter, we write \mathbf{D}_{i_j} as $\overline{\mathbf{D}}_j$, \mathbf{u}_{i_j} as $\overline{\mathbf{u}}_j$, $D_{\ell i_j}$ as $\overline{D}_{\ell j}$ and κ_{i_j} as $\overline{\kappa}_j$. By (20), we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^\rho \overline{\mathbf{D}}_j^{\overline{\kappa}_j} = \prod_{j=1}^\rho \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{\overline{D}_{\ell j}} \right)^{\overline{\kappa}_j} = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^\rho \mathbf{E}_\ell^{\overline{D}_{\ell j} \overline{\kappa}_j} = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{\sum_{j=1}^\rho \overline{D}_{\ell j} \overline{\kappa}_j}.$$

Thus, $\prod_{j=1}^\rho \overline{\mathbf{D}}_j^{\overline{\kappa}_j} = [1_Q]$ if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^\rho \overline{\kappa}_j \overline{\mathbf{u}}_j = 0$ since \mathcal{E} is a basis for Q/\sim so that $\prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{\sum_{j=1}^\rho \overline{D}_{\ell j} \overline{\kappa}_j} = [1_Q]$ if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^\rho \overline{D}_{\ell j} \overline{\kappa}_j = 0$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, m$. Hence, $(\overline{\mathbf{D}}_1, \dots, \overline{\mathbf{D}}_\rho)$ is an independent tuple of dimensions if and only if $(\overline{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \overline{\mathbf{u}}_\rho)$ is a linearly independent tuple of column vectors. In particular, the rank of $[D_{\ell i}]$ is equal to the rank of \mathcal{D} , since the rank of a matrix equals the maximal number of linearly independent columns.

On the assumption that one exists, we fix an adequate partition $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}\}$ of \mathcal{D} . For all $[q_i] = \mathbf{D}_i$ in \mathcal{D} there are, by (14), (16) and (20), $\mathbf{w}_i > 0$, \mathbf{w}_{ij} such that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{D_{\ell i} \mathbf{w}_i} &= \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{D_{\ell i}} \right)^{\mathbf{w}_i} = [q_i]^{\mathbf{w}_i} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{\mathbf{w}_{ij}} = \prod_{j=1}^r \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{D_{\ell j}} \right)^{\mathbf{w}_{ij}} \\ &= \prod_{\ell=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^r \mathbf{E}_\ell^{D_{\ell j} \mathbf{w}_{ij}} = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{E}_\ell^{\sum_{j=1}^r D_{\ell j} \mathbf{w}_{ij}} \quad (i = 0, \dots, n). \end{aligned}$$

As $\{\mathbf{E}_1, \dots, \mathbf{E}_m\}$ is a basis for Q/\sim , this means that every system of equations

$$(21) \quad \begin{cases} D_{1i} \xi_i = D_{11} \xi_{i1} + \dots + D_{1r} \xi_{ir} \\ \dots \\ D_{mi} \xi_i = D_{m1} \xi_{i1} + \dots + D_{mr} \xi_{ir} \end{cases} \quad (i = 0, \dots, n)$$

has a solution $(\xi_i, \xi_{i1}, \dots, \xi_{ir}) = (\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{ir})$ such that

$$(22) \quad [q_i]^{\mathbf{w}_i} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{\mathbf{w}_{ij}} \quad (\mathbf{w}_i > 0).$$

Since $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}\}$ is a partition of (q_1, \dots, q_n, q_0) , there is some i such that $[y_k] = [q_i]$ for each $k = 0, \dots, n-r$. Hence, we can write (22) as (14), setting $w_k = \mathbf{w}_i$ and $w_{kj} = \mathbf{w}_{ij}$. For each $[y_k]$ there is thus, as shown in Section 4, a unique distinguished tuple of integers $(W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr})$ such that $[y_k]^{W_k} = \prod_{j=1}^r [x_j]^{W_{kj}}$, $W_k > 0$ and $\gcd(W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr}) = 1$.

For each adequate partition of \mathcal{D} , the corresponding unique distinguished tuples of integers $(W_k, W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kr})$ can be arranged as rows in a matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_0 & W_{01} & \dots & W_{0r} \\ W_1 & W_{11} & \dots & W_{1r} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ W_{n-r} & W_{(n-r)1} & \dots & W_{(n-r)r} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Each such matrix gives one equation in (18) of the form

$$y_0^{W_{(\ell)0}} = \prod_{j=1}^r x_{(\ell)j}^{W_{(\ell)0j}} \Psi_{\ell}(\pi_{(\ell)1}, \dots, \pi_{(\ell)n-r}),$$

where $\pi_{(\ell)k} = y_{(\ell)k}^{W_{(\ell)k}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r x_{(\ell)j}^{W_{(\ell)kj}} \right)^{-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n-r$.

In physics, $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{E}_1, \dots, \mathbf{E}_m\}$ is the set of dimensions corresponding to a set of base units such as those in the SI system. From a mathematical point of view, the basis \mathcal{E} for Q/\sim can be chosen freely since the dependencies described by (15) are not specified in terms of a basis. Thus, different dimensional matrices may give the same set of representations of Φ . It should be noted, though, that in physics a change of units is often associated with a change of quantity space [17], affecting dependencies among dimensions and quantities.

6. EXAMPLES OF DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS

We start with an example of dimensional analysis in a wide sense, and then proceed to more conventional applications with dimensional matrices as inputs.

Example 1. Consider a dimension tuple $\mathcal{D} = ([x], [1_Q])$, where $[x] \neq [1_Q]$. The tuple $([x])$ is the only maximal independent subtuple of \mathcal{D} , and $([x])$ does not contain $[1_Q]$, so \mathcal{D} has exactly one adequate partition,

$$([x]), \emptyset, ([1_Q]).$$

By Theorem 1 any corresponding (necessarily complete) quantity function of the form $\Phi : [x] \rightarrow [1_Q]$ that admits a covariant scalar representation is a constant function since it has a representation of the form

$$\Phi(x) = x^0 \Psi() = k,$$

where $k \in [1_Q]$ is a constant. Had Φ not admitted a covariant scalar representation then nothing could have been said about how $\Phi(x)$ depends on x , so we obtain specific information about Φ from this assumption.

Example 2. Assume that the time of oscillation t of a pendulum depends on its length ℓ , the mass of the bob m , the amplitude of the oscillation θ (an angle) and the constant of gravity g , that is, $t^W = \Phi(\ell, m, \theta, g)$. Let the dependencies among the dimensions in $\mathcal{D} = ([\ell], [m], [\theta], [g], [t])$ be given by the dimensional matrix

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & [\ell] & [m] & [\theta] & [g] & [t] \\ \mathbf{L} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{T} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 1 \\ \mathbf{M} & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} .$$

There is only one maximal independent subtuple of \mathcal{D} not containing $[t]$, namely $([\ell], [m], [g])$. The corresponding adequate partition of \mathcal{D} is

$$([\ell], [m], [g]), \quad ([\theta]), \quad ([t]),$$

and the dimensional model is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & [\ell] & [m] & [g] & [\theta] & [t] \\ \mathbf{L} & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{T} & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 1 \\ \mathbf{M} & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} .$$

Clearly, $[t]^2 = [\ell]^1 [m]^0 [g]^{-1} = [\ell]^1 [g]^{-1}$ and $[\theta]^1 = [\ell]^0 [m]^0 [g]^0 = [1_Q]$, so we have

$$(23) \quad t^2 = \ell g^{-1} \Psi(\theta/1_Q) = \ell g^{-1} \Psi(\theta).$$

Thus, the time of oscillation does not really depend on the mass of the bob.

Alternatively, choose a local basis E and let t, ℓ, g, θ denote the real numbers $\mu_E(t), \mu_E(\ell), \mu_E(g), \mu_E(\theta)$, respectively. Then (23) becomes $t^2 = \ell g^{-1} \psi(\theta)$, where $\psi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a covariant scalar representation of Ψ , and from the assumption that $t, \ell, g > 0$ follows that $\psi(\theta) > 0$ and that (23) is equivalent to

$$t = \sqrt{\ell g^{-1} \psi(\theta)}.$$

It can be shown [19] that $\sqrt{\psi(\theta)} \rightarrow 2\pi$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0$, so for small oscillations this equation simplifies to $t = 2\pi \sqrt{\ell g^{-1}}$.

Example 3 (based on a problem in Gibbins [10], pp. 107–108). Assume that the force F between two parallel equal-sized plates of a capacitor depends on the area a of each plate, the distance z between the plates, the permittivity ϵ of the dielectric layer, and the potential difference φ , that is, $F^W = \Phi(a, z, \epsilon, \varphi)$, so that $\mathcal{D} = ([a], [z], [\epsilon], [\varphi], [F])$. In the $\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{I}$ system of dimensions we have the following dimensional matrix

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & [a] & [z] & [\epsilon] & [\varphi] & [F] \\ \mathbf{L} & 2 & 1 & -3 & 2 & 1 \\ \mathbf{T} & 0 & 0 & 4 & -3 & -2 \\ \mathbf{M} & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ \mathbf{I} & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \end{array} .$$

Corresponding to the two adequate partitions of \mathcal{D} for which $\mathcal{C} = ([F])$,

$$([a], [\epsilon], [\varphi]), ([z]), ([F]), \quad ([z], [\epsilon], [\varphi]), ([a]), ([F]),$$

there are two dimensional models with F as the dependent variable,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & [a] & [\epsilon] & [\varphi] & [z] & [F] & & [z] & [\epsilon] & [\varphi] & [a] & [F] \\ \text{L} & 2 & -3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & & \text{L} & 1 & -3 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \text{T} & 0 & 4 & -3 & , & 0 & , & -2 & , & \text{T} & 0 & 4 & -3 & , & 0 & , & -2 & , \\ \text{M} & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & & \text{M} & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \text{I} & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & & \text{I} & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$$

and these models give the following equations

$$\begin{cases} F = \epsilon\varphi^2 \psi_1(z^2/a), & (E1) \\ F = \epsilon\varphi^2 \psi_2(a/z^2). & (E2) \end{cases}$$

Note that $\psi_1(x) = \psi_2(x^{-1})$, so it suffices to consider either ψ_1 or ψ_2 . It is known that $F = \frac{\epsilon\varphi^2 a}{2z^2}$ if edge effects are disregarded, meaning that $\psi_2(x) \sim \frac{x}{2}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

The rank of the dimensional matrix is 3, and physically there is no mechanical motion and no flow of current in this example, suggesting that the dimensions T, M and I be replaced by those of force and charge, $F = \text{LT}^{-2}\text{M}$ and $\text{Q} = \text{TI}$. There is indeed a basis $\{\text{L}, \text{F}, \text{Q}, \text{X}\}$ for Q/\sim such that the dimensions in \mathcal{D} can be expressed in terms of $\{\text{L}, \text{F}, \text{Q}\}$ (with only zero exponents for X), giving the dimensional matrix

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & [a] & [z] & [\epsilon] & [\varphi] & [F] \\ \text{L} & 2 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ \text{F} & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ \text{Q} & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \end{array}.$$

We obtain (E1) and (E2) again, as we should, as a change of basis from $\{\text{L}, \text{T}, \text{M}, \text{I}\}$ to $\{\text{L}, \text{F}, \text{Q}, \text{X}\}$ does not affect the dependencies among the dimensions in \mathcal{D} .

Example 4. Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be two bodies of mass a and b , respectively, and let c be the combined mass of \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} . We are looking for a quantity function Φ such that $c^W = \Phi(a, b)$, so $\mathcal{D} = ([a], [b], [c])$. The simple dimensional matrix is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & [a] & [b] & [c] \\ \text{M} & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array},$$

and, corresponding to the two adequate partitions of \mathcal{D} for which $\mathcal{C} = ([c])$,

$$([a]), ([b]), ([c]), \quad ([b]), ([a]), ([c]),$$

there are two dimensional models with c as dependent variable,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & [a] & [b] & [c] & & [b] & [a] & [c] \\ \text{M} & 1 & , & 1 & , & 1 & , & 1 & , & 1 & , & 1 \end{array},$$

giving the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} c = a \Psi_1(b/a), & (M1) \\ c = b \Psi_2(a/b). & (M2) \end{cases}$$

Thus, $a\Psi_1(b/a) = b\Psi_2(a/b)$, and if we assume by symmetry that $\Phi(a, b) = \Phi(b, a)$ then $a\Psi_1(b/a) = \Phi(a, b) = \Phi(b, a) = b\Psi_2(a/b)$, so $\Psi_1 = \Psi_2$. Setting $x = b/a$ we thus obtain a functional equation of the form $\Psi(x) = F(x, \Psi)$, namely

$$\Psi(x) = x \Psi(x^{-1}),$$

which has solutions of the form

$$\Psi(x) = k(1_Q + x) \quad (k, x \in [1_Q]).$$

If $a \neq 0_M$ then $c^W = \Phi(a, b)$ can be represented as $(M1)$, so if $\Phi(a, 0_M) = a$ then $a = a\Psi(0_{[1_Q]}) = ak1_Q$, so $k = 1_Q$. Substituting Ψ for Ψ_1 in $(M1)$, we thus obtain

$$c = k(a + b) = a + b,$$

as one might expect. By symmetry, $\Phi(0_M, b) = b$ for $b \neq 0_M$, so if $\Phi(0_M, 0_M) = 0_M$ then $c = a + b$ for all $a, b \in M$ (but negative masses may not exist physically).

We note that while a quantity function Φ is represented as a product of quantities in dimensional analysis, such a product can sometimes be rewritten as a sum of quantities. It is also clear that addition of masses exemplifies a general principle: if $a, b, \Phi(a, b) \in X \neq [1_Q]$ and $\Phi(a, b) = \Phi(b, a)$ then $\Phi(a, b) = k(a + b)$.

Example 5 (based on a problem in Buckingham [5], pp. 358–359). It is assumed that the energy density u at a fixed point is determined by the strengths E and H of an electric field \mathbf{E} and a magnetic \mathbf{H} -field, respectively, as well as the permittivity ϵ and permeability μ of the medium, that is, $u^W = \Phi(E, H, \epsilon, \mu)$. The dimensional matrix corresponding to $\mathcal{D} = ([E], [H], [\epsilon], [\mu], [u])$ in the L, T, M, I system is

$$\begin{array}{rcccccc} & [E] & [H] & [\epsilon] & [\mu] & [u] \\ \text{L} & 1 & -1 & -3 & 1 & -1 \\ \text{T} & -3 & 0 & 4 & -2 & -2 \\ \text{M} & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ \text{I} & -1 & 1 & 2 & -2 & 0 \end{array} .$$

This matrix has rank 3, and four adequate partitions of $([E], [H], [\epsilon], [\mu], [u])$ with $\mathcal{C} = ([u])$ exist, namely

$$\begin{array}{ll} ([E], [\epsilon], [\mu]), ([H]), ([u]), & ([H], [\epsilon], [\mu]), ([E]), ([u]), \\ ([E], [H], [\epsilon]), ([\mu]), ([u]), & ([E], [H], [\mu]), ([\epsilon]), ([u]). \end{array}$$

The corresponding equations are

$$\begin{cases} u = E^2 \epsilon \Psi_1(H^2 / (E^2 \epsilon \mu^{-1})), & (EM1) \\ u = H^2 \mu \Psi_2(E^2 / (H^2 \epsilon^{-1} \mu)), & (EM2) \\ u = E^2 \epsilon \Psi'_1(\mu / (E^2 H^{-2} \epsilon)), & (EM3) \\ u = H^2 \mu \Psi'_2(\epsilon / (E^{-2} H^2 \mu)). & (EM4) \end{cases}$$

We note that only two distinct functions, say Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 , occur in the representations of Φ . Also, E, H, ϵ, μ occur only in the combinations $E' = \epsilon E^2$ and $H' = \mu H^2$ in these representations, so we can write $u^W = \Phi(E, H, \epsilon, \mu)$ as $u^W = \Phi'(E', H')$, with corresponding dimension tuple $\mathcal{D}' = ([E'], [H'], [u])$ and dimensional matrix

$$\begin{array}{rccc} & [E'] & [H'] & [u] \\ \text{L} & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ \text{T} & -2 & -2 & -2 \\ \text{M} & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \text{I} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} .$$

Thus, $E', H', u \in L^{-1}T^{-2}M$ and there are two adequate partitions of \mathcal{D}' with u as dependent variable,

$$([E']), ([H']), ([u]), \quad ([H']), ([E']), ([u]),$$

and two corresponding representations of Φ' ,

$$\begin{cases} u = E' \Psi'_1(H'/E'), & (EM1') \\ u = H' \Psi'_2(E'/H'). & (EM2') \end{cases}$$

Buckingham also finds these representations, writing them as $u = \epsilon E^2 \varphi_1\left(\frac{\mu H^2}{\epsilon E^2}\right)$ and $u = \mu H^2 \varphi_2\left(\frac{\epsilon E^2}{\mu H^2}\right)$ [5, p. 359]. He then remarks:

Assuming that the complete formula is

$$u = \frac{1}{8\pi}(\epsilon E^2 + \mu H^2)$$

we have

$$\varphi_1(x) = \varphi_2(x) = \frac{1+x}{8\pi}.$$

In dimensional analysis, we are not supposed to know "the complete formula" at the outset, however, so let us reverse this inference. We have $E' \Psi'_1(H'/E') = H' \Psi'_2(E'/H')$, and if we assume, invoking a physical symmetry between \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{H} , that $\Phi'(E', H') = \Phi'(H', E')$ so that $E' \Psi'_1(H'/E') = E' \Psi'_2(H'/E')$ then we conclude that $\Psi'_1 = \Psi'_2$, so setting $x = H'/E'$ we obtain the functional equation $\Psi(x) = x \Psi(x^{-1})$ as in Example 4. Again, $\Psi(x) = k(1_Q + x)$, where $k, x \in [1_Q]$, and substituting this in $(EM1')$ or $(EM2')$ we obtain

$$u = k(\epsilon E^2 + \mu H^2),$$

or $u = k(\epsilon E^2 + \mu^{-1} B^2)$ if $B = \mu H$.

Working with examples, Buckingham thus recognised in [5] that there may be more than one way of representing Φ . However, he dismissed this observation by asserting that then the representations are "equivalent" [5, p. 359, 362], implying that it suffices to consider any one of them.

Example 6 (based on a problem in Bridgman [4], pp. 5–8). Let two bodies \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{b} with masses M and m revolve around each other under influence of their mutual gravitational attraction, as in the classical two-body problem. Let t denote the time of revolution and d the mean distance between \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{b} (or another characteristic distance). One might want to find out how t depends on M , m and d , but there is no adequate partition of $([M], [m], [d], [t])$ such that $\mathcal{C} = ([t])$ since $(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{M})$ is an independent dimension tuple. There is thus no local basis E such that $\mu_E(t^W)$ is defined, so $\Phi_0 : [M] \times [m] \times [d] \rightarrow [t^W]$ does not have a "physically meaningful" – that is, covariant – scalar representation. Bridgman suggests that t does also depend on the gravitational constant G , that is, $t^W = \Phi(M, m, d, G)$, giving the dimensional matrix

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & [M] & [m] & [d] & [G] & [t] \\ \mathbf{L} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ \mathbf{T} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 1 \\ \mathbf{M} & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{array}.$$

There are two adequate partitions of $([t], [M], [m], [d], [G])$ with $\mathcal{C} = ([t])$,

$$([M], [d], [G]), ([m]), ([t]), \quad ([m], [d], [G]), ([M]), ([t]),$$

so we obtain a system of two equations,

$$\begin{cases} t^2 = M^{-1} d^3 G^{-1} \Psi_1(m/M), & (K1) \\ t^2 = m^{-1} d^3 G^{-1} \Psi_2(M/m). & (K2) \end{cases}$$

Hence, $M^{-1}\Psi_1(m/M) = m^{-1}\Psi_2(M/m)$, and for symmetry reasons we may assume that $\Phi(M, m, d, G) = \Phi(m, M, d, G)$ so that $M^{-1}\Psi_1(m/M) = M^{-1}\Psi_2(m/M)$. This implies $\Psi_1 = \Psi_2$, so setting $x = m/M$ we obtain the functional equation

$$\Psi(x) = x^{-1} \Psi(x^{-1}).$$

This functional equation has solutions of the form

$$\Psi(x) = k(1_Q + x)^{-1} \quad (k, x \in [1_Q]),$$

and substituting this in either (K1) or (K2) gives

$$(24) \quad t^2 = kd^3G^{-1}(M+m)^{-1}.$$

Here, k and G are constants, so if $M+m \approx M$ and M is constant (several planets orbit the sun) then, approximately, $t^2 \propto d^3$; this is Kepler's third law.

As before, (24) can be interpreted both as a quantity equation and as a scalar equation, and the latter can also be written as

$$(25) \quad t = c\sqrt{d^3G^{-1}(M+m)^{-1}}.$$

It is worth pointing out that Bridgman considered only one equation, namely

$$t = \frac{r^{\frac{3}{2}}}{G^{\frac{1}{2}}m_2^{\frac{1}{2}}}\phi\left(\frac{m_2}{m_1}\right),$$

corresponding to (K1) with $\phi(m_2/m_1) = \Psi_1(m_1/m_2)$ or (K2) with $\phi(m_2/m_1) = \Psi_2(m_1/m_2)$. The basic reason why Bridgman was not able to derive the much more informative equation (25) was that he did not reflect on the possibility that the original function could have more than one representation, and as a consequence he did not reflect on what inferences could be drawn from symmetries between different representations. Remarkably, the same restricted way of thinking still dominates dimensional analysis, next to a century after the appearance of Bridgman's classic [4], but mathematics does not always move quickly.

7. EX NIHILO NIHIL FIT

Some examples of dimensional analysis give the impression that it can be used to derive physical laws "out of nothing". This is of course an illusion; while the assumptions may be hidden or so intuitive as to be overlooked, assumptions there are. Recall, in particular, that the application of Theorem 1 to dimensional analysis is based on the premise that the quantity function Φ posited has a covariant scalar representation. Thus, to assume that $\zeta = \Phi(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$ is a "physically meaningful" scalar equation, so that we can obtain an equation $\zeta = \prod_{j=1}^r \xi_j^{W_{0j}} \psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r})$ by dimensional analysis, is to assume that ϕ is a covariant scalar representation of a quantity function Φ . This assumption, underlying dimensional analysis, is a general covariance principle about the equivalence of certain reference frames, defined by corresponding systems of units of measurement.

Also, stronger assumptions will in general lead to stronger results. For example, to derive (24) in Example 6 we had to assume that $\Phi(M, m, d, G) = \Phi(m, M, d, G)$. The symmetry between \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{b} motivating this assumption would in turn seem to require that a description of the situation in which \mathfrak{B} is at rest and \mathfrak{b} revolves around \mathfrak{B} is equivalent to a description in which \mathfrak{b} is at rest and \mathfrak{B} revolves around \mathfrak{b} , so that we may reverse the roles of \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{b} . This is in fact a deep symmetry assumption, related to Mach's principle.

8. CONCLUSION

In modern algebra, an abstract vector is the real thing while its coordinates is the shadow of the vector, dependent not only on the vector itself but also on the location of the source of illumination – a particular choice of basis. The notion of quantity calculus [2] derives from an analogous duality between the quantities measured and the numbers serving as their measures, and an idea of the primacy of quantities. From this perspective, we need a new π theorem which is about quantities, not primarily about numbers. Theorems 1 and 2 are reformulations of the π theorem designed to meet this need.

The proposed reconceptualisation requires a mathematical definition of the notion of a quantity. As defined here, a quantity is simply an element of a quantity space, defined, in turn, in [13] and Section 2. The operations and identities characterising quantity spaces define a quantity calculus suitable for formulating a quantity counterpart of the π theorem.

As we have seen, the fact that a theorem about scalars (measures), the π theorem, is replaced by a theorem about quantities as a basis for dimensional analysis does not mean that dimensional analysis can no longer yield scalar equations, but the new way of thinking leads to other consequences and benefits that concern the logic, results and practice of dimensional analysis.

Despite its long history and widespread use, dimensional analysis remains somewhat unsettled and controversial. There is apparently still room for foundational work, and the rigorous algebraic foundation provided by the theory of quantity spaces and Theorem 1 would seem to clarify essential mathematical aspects of dimensional analysis. In particular, a precise mathematical meaning is given to the notion of a "physically meaningful" scalar equation.

Secondly, the new approach to dimensional analysis redefines the results that can be expected from it. Instead of representing ϕ such that $\phi(t_1, \dots, t_n) = 0$ by ψ such that $\psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r}) = 0$, as in Vaschy's and Buckingham's original π theorem, we prefer to represent ϕ such that $t^W = \phi(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ by means of ψ such that $t^W = \prod_{j=1}^r x_j^{W_j} \psi(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-r})$. Even more significantly, we derive an equation system of representations rather than a single representation. Such an equation system can then make it possible to extract additional information about ϕ that could not have been obtained by means of any single equation, or even all equations considered individually.

Finally, it should be noted that we have presented an algorithmic technique for dimensional analysis. We have described rules that make it possible to generate unique equation systems from a dimensional matrix, obtaining one system for each mathematically legitimate choice of dependent variable. It would not be difficult to create a computer implementation of this algorithm.

REFERENCES

- [1] Atherton, M.A., Bates, R.A., Wynn, H.P. (2014). Dimensional Analysis Using Toric Ideals: Primitive Invariants. *PLoS ONE*, **9** (12), e112827.
- [2] de Boer, J. (1994). On the history of quantity calculus and the international system, *Metrologia*, **31**, 405–429.
- [3] Brand, L. (1957). The Pi Theorem of Dimensional Analysis. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, **1** (1), 35-45.
- [4] Bridgman P.W. (1922). *Dimensional Analysis*. Yale University Press.

- [5] Buckingham, E. (1914). On physically similar systems: illustrations of the use of dimensional equations. *Physical Review*, **4** (4), 345–376.
- [6] Carlson, D.E. (1978). A mathematical theory of physical units, dimensions and measures. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, **70**, 289–304.
- [7] Drobot, S. (1953). On the foundations of dimensional analysis. *Studia Mathematica*, **14**, 84–99.
- [8] Federman, A. (1911). On some general methods of integration of first-order partial differential equations. *Proceedings of the Saint-Petersburg polytechnic institute. Section of technology, natural science and mathematics*, **16** (1), 97–155. (In Russian.)
- [9] Fourier, J. (1822). *Théorie analytique de la chaleur*. Paris.
- [10] Gibbings, J.C. (2011). *Dimensional Analysis*. Springer.
- [11] Jonsson, D. (2014). Quantities, Dimensions and Dimensional Analysis. arXiv:1408.5024.
- [12] Jonsson, D. (2014). Dimensional Analysis: A Centenary Update. arXiv:1411.2798.
- [13] Jonsson, D. (2019). Magnitudes Reborn: Quantity Spaces as Scalable Monoids. arXiv:1911.07236.
- [14] Jonsson, D. (2020). The Pi Theorem Revisited: On Representations of Quantity Functions. arXiv:2005.10645.
- [15] Langhaar, H.L. (1951). *Dimensional Analysis and Theory of Models*. Wiley.
- [16] Quade, W. (1961). Über die algebraische Struktur des Größenkalküls der Physik. *Abhandlungen der Braunschweigischen Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft*, **13**, 24–65.
- [17] Raposo, A.P. (2018). The Algebraic Structure of Quantity Calculus. *Measurement Science Review*, **18** (4), 147–157.
- [18] Raposo, A.P. (2019). The Algebraic Structure of Quantity Calculus II: Dimensional Analysis and Differential and Integral Calculus. *Measurement Science Review*, **19** (2), 70–78.
- [19] Sedov, L.I. (1993). *Similarity and Dimensional Methods in Mechanics*, 10th ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- [20] Szekeres, P. (1978). The Mathematical Foundations of Dimensional Analysis and the Question of Fundamental Units. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, **17**, 957–974.
- [21] Vaschy, A. (1892). Sur les lois de similitude en physique. *Annales Télégraphiques*, **19**, 25–28.
- [22] White, F.M. (2011). *Fluid Mechanics*, 7th ed. McGrawHill, New York.
- [23] Whitney, H. (1968). The mathematics of physical quantities: Part II: Quantity structures and dimensional analysis. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, **75**, 227–256.

DAN JONSSON, UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG, GOTHENBURG, SWEDEN
 Email address: dan.jonsson@gu.se